

<h1>ACF</h1> Administration for Children and Families	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES Administration for Children, Youth and Families	
	1. Log No: ACYF- PI-82-06	2. Issuance Date: June 3, 1982
	3. Originating Office: Children's Bureau	
	4. Key Words: Section 427 Validation Review P.L. 96-272	

ACYF STAFF INSTRUCTION

TO: Regional Program Directors Administration for Children, Youth and Families

SUBJECT: Guidance to ACYF Regional officials in validating State Certification of Compliance with Section 427 of the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-272)

BACKGROUND

The Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980, P.L. 96-272, provides funding support to encourage States to modify practices and policies which lead to inappropriate use of foster care by establishing certain protections for children as requirements for State eligibility for Federal payments above \$141,000,000 under title IV-B.

In order to be eligible for such funding a State should

-- have conducted an inventory of all children who have been in foster care for six months or more and determined the appropriateness and the necessity of the placements, the likelihood of family reunification or the need to consider adoption and the services necessary to provide a permanent placement;

-- have implemented and have been operating

- a statewide information system which meets certain case management needs for all children currently in foster care or who have been in foster care in the preceding twelve months

- a case review system for each child in foster care

- a service program to facilitate reunification with families or other permanent placement; and
- have implemented and have had in operation a preplacement preventive service program designed to help children remain with their families.

Moreover, to be eligible for funds in a given fiscal year, a State's systems must be implemented and in operation for all affected children by September 30 of that year.

In FY 1981, the first year for which section 427 was applicable, States were instructed to declare their eligibility by means of a statement of self-certification. This approach was necessary as the Department had not yet published final regulations, and other logistical constraints would have made on-site compliance reviews practically impossible.

States were requested to self-certify on the basis of their understanding of the statutory requirements and a analysis of the related child welfare system policies implemented and in operation within the State during FY 1981. They were also informed that their self-certification would be subject to a review by the Department to assure that policies and program questions complied with the section 427 requirements.

In determining an individual State's eligibility under section 427, it has been important to emphasize two methodological considerations. First, even in the absence of clarifying regulations, the Department must assure conformity and equity in the interpretation of statutory requirements. Second, as States had no basis for determining their own eligibility other than the statute itself, the Department cannot now impose any more specific (and in all likelihood limiting or restrictive) standards or criteria beyond those identified in P.L. 96-272.

Keeping in mind these two important considerations, ACYF undertook a pilot review activity with the States beginning earlier this year. Based largely on the three pilot compliance reviews conducted in Missouri, Utah and Connecticut and on analysis and feedback subsequent to these reviews, ACYF has refined the process for conducting such reviews and has developed guidance to address questions and other issues that will invariably surface in the context of these reviews.

The attached materials provide regional staff with a format for conducting the reviews and reporting on State eligibility. In effect, the attached forms represent internal checklists that catalogue verbatim, elements in the statute that form the basis for Section 427 compliance.

BASIC INFORMATION

States have been given several options to review their compliance with the section 427 requirements. These include:

Option 1: The case record review may be conducted by a team of Federal reviewers. A sequential sampling technique would be used requiring a random sample of no more than 160 case records in larger States and no more than 85 case records in States with fewer than 1,000 children in foster

care.

Option 2: Using the same sampling procedure as in Option 1, the case record review may be conducted by a combined team of Federal and State reviewers. The State reviewers would be selected by the State from its staff.

Option 3: The State may conduct its own review of case records, using the sampling methodology of its choice if Federal criteria for reliability and decision points are met. A Federal team would review a smaller subsample to verify and validate the State review.

The sequential sampling methodology under options 1 and 2 has been chosen to provide maximum confidence in the findings with a minimum of case reading and, therefore, a minimum of staff time. It allows a limited number of randomly selected case records to be reviewed one after the other only until certain decision points are reached.

Under this method, a statistically valid random sample of approximately 160 case records (10 extra to allow for error) is drawn from throughout the State. The State should be encouraged to assemble the case records in a central location for review because the sampling procedure requires that they be read in the same order they are selected, regardless of what region of the State they are from. (If this sampling method is chosen, but State cannot assemble cases in one location, the Regional staff should consult with the Central Office Children's Bureau.)

States with legislation or written policy guidelines or regulations to initiate periodic case reviews prior to six months after placement may include such cases in the case record sample. Thus, all children who have been in foster care for at least one periodic case review by September 30, 1981 may be included in the universe of case records to be sampled, i.e., a State which begins the periodic review at 45 days after placement may include children who entered placement by August 16, 1981 or earlier.

As a very small sample is used and items rated "Not Applicable" are given a positive value it is necessary to use a stratified random sample to provide evidence that the case plan, the periodic case review, and the procedural safeguards including the dispositional hearing have been implemented and are operating in accordance with the legislation.

Whichever option is selected, the review by ACYF staff will include 2 principal activities:

- review of State administrative procedures; and
- review of a sample of case records.

The following discussion describes the process employed in both components of the review and highlights major issues and concerns based on the pilot review experience and subsequent impact from Federal and State staff who participated in the reviews.

A. Review of State Administrative Procedures

The review of administrative procedures is designed to determine the State's specific response to the legislative requirements of section 427, as established by State laws, policies, procedures and systems. In effect, the review focuses on the following major administrative components:

- the statewide inventory;
- the statewide information system;
- the case review system; and
- a service program.

1. Inventory

Section 427(a)(1)... "has conducted an inventory of all children who have been in foster care under the responsibility of the State for a period of six months preceding the inventory, and determined the appropriateness of, and necessity for, the current placement, whether the child can be or should be returned to his parents or should be freed for adoption, and the services necessary to facilitate either the return of the child or the placement of the child for adoption or legal guardianship."

Two components are key in determining whether State completion of an inventory satisfies the statutory requirements. First, the process used in conducting the inventory must assure that a complete and accurate listing is made of all children in foster care for at least six months preceding the inventory. While the nature and form of such an inventory may vary from one State to the next, it is important to examine the source(s) of information that comprises the actual inventory.

Second, the State should have procedures for determining the appropriateness of and the necessity for each child's current placement and the services necessary to facilitate permanent placement for each child identified in the inventory. This, too, must be examined during the administrative review stage.

2. Statewide Information System

Sec. 427(a)(2) "...has implemented and is operating to the satisfaction of the Secretary--

"(A) a statewide information system from which the status, demographic characteristics, location and goals of every child in foster care or who has been in such care within the preceding twelve months can readily be determined;"

The attached checklist addresses the four key elements of the information system requirement: demographic characteristics; legal status; location; and placement goals. It is also important to verify that the system contains information on all children in foster care (including those identified in the inventory) and that it is in operation throughout the State.

3. Case Review System

Section 475(5). "The term 'case review system' means a procedure for assuring that--

"(A) each child has a case plan designed to achieve placement in the least restrictive (most family like) setting available and in close proximity to the parents' home, consistent with the best interest and special needs of the child,

"(B) the status of each child is reviewed periodically but no less frequently than once every six months by either a court or by administrative review (as defined in paragraph (6)) in order to determine the continuing necessity for and appropriateness of the placement, the extent of compliance with the case plan, and the extent of process which has been made toward alleviating or mitigating the causes necessitating placement in foster care, and to project a likely date by which the child may be returned home or placed for adoption or legal guardianship, and

"(C) with respect to each such child, procedural safeguards will be applied, among other things, to assure each child in foster care under the supervision of the State of a dispositional hearing to be held, in a family or juvenile court or another court (including a tribal court) of competent jurisdiction, or by an administrative body appointed or approved by the court, no later than eighteen months after the original placement (and periodically thereafter during the continuation of foster care), which hearing shall determine the future status of the child (including, but not limited to, whether the child should be returned to the parent, should be continued in foster care for a specified period, should be placed for adoption, or should (because of the child's special needs or circumstances) be continued in foster care on a permanent or long-term basis);

"and procedural safeguards shall also be applied with respect to parental rights pertaining to the removal of the child from the home of his parents, to a change in the child's placement, and to any determination affecting visitation privileges of parents."

For purposes of the review, and this aspect of the 427 compliance, the attached checklist breaks the major requirements of the case review system down into two

components: the case plan and the case review (including the periodic review and dispositional hearings).

a. Case Plan

Sec. 475(1) "...The term 'case plan' means a written document which includes at least the following: A description of the type of home or institution in which a child is to be placed, including a discussion of the appropriateness of the placement and how the agency which is responsible for the child plans to carry out the judicial determination made with respect to the child in accordance with section 472(a)(1); and that services are provided to the parents, child, and foster parents in order to improve the conditions in the parents' home, facilitate return of the child to his own home or the permanent placement of the child, and address the needs of the child while in foster care, including a discussion of the appropriateness of the services that have been provided to the child under the plan."

Here again, the form of such a plan may vary from State to State. Thus, it is important to focus on the specific means that a State has employed in addressing the essential elements of the statutory definition (e.g. description of placement setting, discussion of appropriateness of placement, etc.). The attached checklist enumerates seven essential elements.

b. Case Review

The basic requirements pertaining to the case review (which are part of the overall case review system) are outlined in Sec. 475(5) cited earlier and are contained in the attached checklist.

The checklist attempts to isolate each of these requirements by clustering them into five (5) major groupings. These include items that relate to:

- specific case plan elements;
- the requirement for a periodic review;
- the nature of the periodic review;
- the nature of an administrative review; and
- procedural safeguards.

The case plan elements specified as part of the case review system (in Sec. 475(5)(A)) augment the definition of a case plan provided in Sec. 475(1).

In this instance, it is important to inquire into the State's formal procedures for assuring the most appropriate placement for the child.

As for the periodic review, the review team must determine whether the State's procedures provide for a review by a court or for an administrative review as defined in the Act.

When the periodic review is an administrative review, the team must determine that the review is conducted by a panel which includes at least one person who is not responsible for the case management or the delivery of services to the child or parents. This should be verified by the State's procedures and policy manuals and it must be determined how the requirement will be verified in the case record.

Procedures must also be verified for assuring that administrative reviews are open to parental participation.

Lastly, there are items that pertain to procedural safeguards (i.e.; the dispositional hearing and related parental rights).

The dispositional hearing differs from the periodic review in that it requires the involvement of a court or an administrative body acting on behalf of the court; and it requires that a hearing be held with the concomitant due process safeguards that apply to court proceedings.

The review team should examine the State's arrangements with the courts in the conduct of dispositional hearings--both the dispositional hearing required within 18 months of placement and subsequent hearings "periodically thereafter".

When the dates of the dispositional hearing and the periodic review coincide, the dispositional hearing can replace the periodic review. Periodic reviews, however, cannot substitute for dispositional hearings unless they are held in a court or by a body appointed or approved by a court which address the elements required in 475(5)(C).

P.L. 96-272 also emphasizes safeguarding the rights of parents of children in foster care or who may enter foster care. States are required to apply procedural safeguards for certain critical events designated by the Act. The review team should explore the specific safeguards implemented by the State for each of the designated critical events specified in the legislation to assure that there is a system of procedural safeguards in place to protect the rights of parents.

States are free to determine the nature and method of procedural safeguards. These may include prior written notice, verification that notice was received, notification in the language of the recipient to assure understanding, right to

review, comment and object to any intended change, right to be represented by counsel before the agency or courts, procedures to assure that objections of parents will be considered by the agency and can be appealed through agency review or hearing processes. Reviewers should identify the States' procedural safeguards, how they can be implemented and what documents or other verification may be found in case records.

4. Service Program

The service program requirements that should be examined during the administrative review of State compliance with P.L. 96-272 are authorized in Sec. 427(a)(2)(C) and Sec. 427(b)(3). These requirements are restated in the attached checklist and are largely self explanatory. One item deals with permanency planning services for those already removed from their homes; the other focuses on preplacement preventive services designed to help children remain with their families.

B. Review of a Sample of Case Records

The second component of the compliance review requires a review of a sample of foster care case record. The twenty-one (21) case record survey items contained in the attached form are derived directly from sections 472 and 475 of the law.

Assuming that the State has met the 5 major requirements of section 427 (covered in the review of the State's administrative procedures), a minimum of 66% or 88% of sampled cases must be found acceptable for the State to attain conditional compliance or substantial compliance, respectively. To be found acceptable, a case record should show evidence of:

- a case plan;
- a periodic review;
- a dispositional hearing (if applicable); and
- 13 of the remaining 18 elements of section 427.

Conditional compliance (66% to 79%) allows the State FFP under section 427 for the year under review and provides an additional year for the State to meet the 80% (substantial compliance) level. If 65% or fewer sampled cases are found acceptable, the State would be considered ineligible for its share of funds under section 427.

Additional questions concerning case reviews have been raised as a result of the pilot compliance reviews conducted in Missouri, Utah and Connecticut. Attachment D, "Policy

Guidance for Certain Section 427 Requirements" provides information and guidance in dealing with these questions.

C. Exit Conference and Other Post-Review Activities

On completion of the review, it is expected that the team conduct an exit interview with the State agency administrators in which general impressions of the review may be conveyed. However, binding statements regarding State eligibility should not be made until the review findings have been fully analyzed.

Assuming that the Regional office finds the State in compliance--either substantially or conditionally--

The Regional office should provide the State with a report within 15 work days of the case record review including a summary of the results of the review for each major requirement, and a copy of the form "Report on State Eligibility".

The summary should specify

- the State's eligibility under section 427(a), and 427(b), if relevant;
- areas of excellence as well as weak performance; and
- reasons for each component found to be "not met" with recommendations to achieve conformity with the requirements.

Copies of the team's report and the Report on State Eligibility should be sent to the ACYF Commissioner and to the State Grants Division of the Children's Bureau.

If, on the other hand, the State has not met the requirements, it is expected that the Regional office notify the State of its recommendation of disapproval within 15 work days of the review.

Such a recommendation for disapproval must be made within 15 work days of the review to the Commissioner, ACYF, with copies to the Associate Chief, Children's Bureau and the State Grants Division. The decision package must include:

- a copy of the Report on State Eligibility; and
- a draft letter to the State agency for the signature of the Commissioner, ACYF, notifying the State of disapproval with an analysis of the reasons for disapproval and recommendations for actions which would bring the State into compliance.

The final decision will be made by the ACYF Commissioner, after consultation with the Regional Program Director and the Assistant Secretary, HDS. If the recommendation is upheld, a

letter of disapproval from the Commissioner will be sent to the State and a copy to the Regional Program Director.

The official file for all section 427 approvals shall be in the Regional Office. The official file for all section 427 denials shall be in the Children's Bureau, Central Office.

/s/

Clarence E. Hodges
Commissioner, ACYF

Attachments:

[Attachment A](#) - Report on State Eligibility

[Attachment B](#) - State Agency Administrative Review

[Attachment C](#) - Case Record Survey

[Attachment D](#) - Policy Guidance for Certain Section 427 Requirements

[Attachment E](#) - Case Record Sample Survey for Section 427 of the Social Security Act (SSA) Eligibility Determination

ATTACHMENT A

Report on State Eligibility State

Date Completed:

ACYF Staff Completing Report:

STATE

I. STATE AGENCY LEVEL REVIEW

The State () has () has not met all section 427(a) requirements at the State level for FY 1981.

Comment:

The State () has () has not met all section 427(a) requirements at the State level for FY 1982.

Comment:

STATE

II. CASE RECORD SURVEY SUMMARY

FY 1981

Number of case records surveyed

Major safeguards were not met in case records.

Less than 13 of 18 protections were met in case records.

CASE RECORD SURVEY:

- Acceptable
- Conditionally Acceptable
- Unacceptable

FY 1982

Number of case records surveyed

Major safeguards were not met in case records.

Less than 13 of 18 protections were met in case records.

CASE RECORD SURVEY:

- Acceptable
- Conditionally Acceptable
- Decision Withheld

Determination of State Eligibility Under Section 427 of the Social Security Act

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Inventory of Children in Foster Care	Met ()	Not Met ()
Recommendations:		
B. Statewide Information System	()	()
Recommendations:		
C. Case Review System	Met ()	Not Met ()
Recommendations:		
D. Reunification and Permanent Placement Services	()	()
Recommendations:		
E. Pre-placement Preventive Services	()	()
Recommendations:		

FINDINGS

FY 1981

1. 1. The findings of the verification review indicate the State of () is, () is conditionally, () is not in compliance with the requirements of section 427(a).
2. Add some sentence as item 4 below

FY 1982

3. The findings of the verification review indicate the State of () is, () is conditionally, in compliance with the requirements of section 427(a); Decision withheld pending further review ().
4. The findings of the verification review indicate the State of () is, () is conditionally, () is not

in compliance with the replacement preventive service requirements of section 427(b).
 Decision withheld pending further review ().

Regional Program Date
 Director

Review Team Date
 Leader
 Unit Supervisor

ATTACHMENT B

I. STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW			
427(a)(1) Inventory			
(1)		YES	NO
(A)	Has the State conducted an inventory of all children who have been in foster care under the responsibility of the State for a period of six months preceding inventory'		
(B)	For each child has the State determined the appropriateness of and necessity for, the current foster placement, and whether the child can be or should be returned to his parents or freed for adoption'		
(C)	For each child in the inventory, has the State determined the services necessary to facilitate either the return of the child or the placement of the child for adoption or legal guardianship'		
427(a)(2)(A) Statewide Information System			
Does the State agency have a statewide information system from which the following data can readily be determined for all children currently in foster care and children who have been in foster care within the preceding 12 months:			
		YES	NO

(A)	Demographic characteristics		
(B)	Legal custody status		
(C)	Location		
(D)	Placement goals		

427(a)(2)(B) Case Review System

Case Plan

For each child receiving foster care maintenance payments, there is a case plan which is a written document.

The case plan includes at a minimum

		YES	NO
(A)	a description of the type of home or institution in which the child is to be placed;		
(B)	a discussion of the appropriateness of the placement		
(C)	a discussion of how the responsible agency plans to carry out the judicial determination made with respect to the child in accordance with Section 472(a)(1)*;		
(D)	a plan for assuring that the child receives proper care:		
(E)	a plan for assuring that services are provided to the child and parents to improve conditions in the parent's home and facilitate return of		

	the child to his own home;		
<p>* Section 472(a)(1) - "The removal from the home was the result of a judicial determination to the effect that continuation therein would be contrary to the welfare of such child and (effective October 1, 1983) that reasonable efforts of the type described in Section 471(a)(15) have been made."</p>			
		YES	NO
(F)	a plan for assuring that services are provided to the child and foster parents to facilitate return of the child to his own home or the permanent placement of the child and address the needs of the child while in foster care;		
(G)	a discussion of the appropriateness of the services that have been provided the child under the plan.		
<p>(2) Case Review</p> <p>The State agency has a case review system which meets the requirements of Section 475(5) of the Act and assures that</p>			
		YES	NO
(A)	the case plan for each child is designed to achieve:		
	i. placement in the least restrictive (most family like) setting available and		
	ii. placement in close proximity to the parent's home consistent with the best interests and special needs of the child		

(B)	the status of each child is reviewed periodically but no less frequently than once every six months by either a court or an administrative review;		
(C)	the periodic review		
	i. determines the continuing need for and appropriateness of the placement;		
	ii. determines the extent of compliance with the case plan;		
	iii. determines the extent of progress made toward alleviating or mitigating the causes necessitating the placement in foster care; and		
	iv. projects a likely date by which the child may be returned home or placed for adoption or legal guardianship.		
(D)	in an administrative review the following requirements specified in Sec. 475(6) are met:		
	i. the review is open to the participation of the parent(s) of the child, and		
	ii. the review is conducted by a panel of appropriate persons at least one of whom is not responsible for the case management of, or the delivery of services to, either the child or the parent(s) who are the subject of the review.		
(E)	The State agency applies procedural safeguards with respect to each child in foster care under supervision of the State which		

	assure that		
	<p>i. a dispositional hearing is held in a family or juvenile court or another court(including a tribal court) of competent jurisdiction or by an administrative body appointed or approved by the court, no later than 18 months after the originalplacement (and periodically thereafter during the continuation of foster care);</p>		
	<p>ii. the dispositional hearing determines the future status of the child including whether the child should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be returned to the parent(s) or - be continued in foster care for a specified period or - be placed for adoption or - because of the child's special needs foster care on a permanent or long term basis; 		
	<p>iii. <u>*</u> Procedural safeguards are applied with respect to parental rights pertaining to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. removal of the child from his or her parent's home 2. a change in the child's placement 3. any determination affecting visitation privileges of the parent(s) 		
427(a)(2)(C) Permanency Planning Service			
		YES	NO

Has the State implemented and does it have operating a service program designed to help children, where appropriate, return to families from which they have been removed or be placed for adoption or legal guardianship?		
427(b)(3) Preplacement Preventive Services (for States Certifying Compliance with Section 427(b)(3))		
Has the State implemented a preplacement preventive service program designed to help children remain with their families?		
* Required for states wishing to claim FFP for children placed in foster care pursuant to a voluntary placement agreement (Section 472(d) of the Social Security Act as amended by Section 102(a)(2) of P.L. 96-272).		

ATTACHMENT C

CASE RECORD SURVEY

Case Record ID Number	Reviewer:	
Sample Number	Date:	
Case Data:		
1. Date of Placement		
2. FY 81:		
Periodic review date	Completed	None due
Disp. hearing date	Completed	None due
FY 82:		
Periodic review date	Completed	None due
Periodic review date	Completed	None due
Disp. hearing date	Completed	None due

Findings:						
3. Major safeguards:	FY 81			FY 82		
	Yes	No	Nonedue	Yes	No	Nonedue
Written case Plan						
Periodic Review						
Dispositional Hearing						
4. of the remaining 18 protections.						
FY 81:	ACCEPTANCE	()		NOT ACCEPTANCE	()	
FY 82:	ACCEPTANCE	()		NOT ACCEPTANCE	()	

CASE PLAN

	YES	NO	N/A
A. IS THERE A WRITTEN CASE PLAN?			
1. Does the plan describe the type of home or institution in which the child is to be placed?			
2. Does the plan give the reason(s) for the placement and for the particular type of placement chosen?			
3. Have efforts been made to place the child in the least restrictive (most family-like) setting available consistent with the best interests and special needs of the child?			
4. Have efforts been made to place the child in close proximity to the parent's home consistent with the best interests and special needs of the child?			
5. Does the plan make provision to carry out any judicial determination made with respect to the child?			
6. Does the plan provide a mechanism for assuring the proper			

care of the child'			
7. Does the case plan include a plan for assuring that services are provided to the CHILD AND PARENTS to improve the conditions in the parent's home and facilitate return of the child home or other permanent placement of the child'			
8. Does the case plan include a plan for assuring that services are provided to the CHILD AND FOSTER PARENTS to address the needs of the child while in foster care'			
9. Does the plan discuss the appropriate-ness of the services THAT HAVE BEEN PROVIDED the child under the plan'			

PERIODIC REVIEW

	YES	NO	N/A
B. IS THE STATUS OF THE CHILD REVIEWED NO LESS FREQUENTLY THAN ONCE EVERY SIX MONTHS BY EITHER A COURT OR AN ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW'			
10. Have the periodic reviews determined the continuing need for and appropriateness of the placement'			
11. Have the periodic reviews determined the extent of compliance with the case plan'			
12. Have the periodic reviews determined the extent of progress made toward alleviating or mitigating the causes necessitating the placement in foster care'			
13. Have the periodic reviews projected a likely date by which the child may be returned home or placed for adoption or legal guardianship'			
14. IF the last periodic review was an administrative review, was it open to the participation of the parent's of the child'			
15. IF the periodic review was an administrative review, was it			

conducted by a panel of appropriate persons at least one of whom is not responsible for the case management of, or the delivery of services to, either the child or the parents who are the subject of the review'			
--	--	--	--

PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

	YES	NO	N/A
C. WAS A DISPOSITIONAL HEARING TO DETERMINE THE FUTURE STATUS OF THE CHILD HELD IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 475(5)(C) NO LATER THAN 18 MONTHS AFTER ORIGINAL PLACEMENT AND PERIODICALLY THEREAFTER'			
16. Were the parents notified concerning the agency's intent to petition the court to remove the child from the home'			
17. Were the parents notified of any changes in the child's placement'			
18. Were the parents notified of any changes affecting visitation rights'			

ATTACHMENT D

Policy Guidance for Certain Section 427 Requirements

The following questions and answers are provided in response to issues raised in the recent field test of section 427 certification review procedures. This guidance is incorporated into the revised review procedures.

Question 1:

Must dispositional hearings and periodic reviews be held for children placed in foster care on a "long-term" or permanent basis by a court'

Answer:

Section 475(5)(C) states that the dispositional hearing:

"Shall determine the future status of the child (including but not limited to, whether the child should be returned to the parent, should be continued in foster care for a specified period, should be placed for adoption, or should (because of the child's special needs or circumstances) be continued in foster care on a permanent or long-term basis)..."

There is no need for further dispositional hearings for children whom a court has determined should remain permanently in foster care, whether the permanent placement is with relatives or non-relatives. The periodic review requirement continues to apply to children in long term or "permanent" foster care inasmuch as all children in foster care should be afforded the benefits of continuous case plan assessments.

Questions 2:

Must dispositional hearings and periodic reviews be held for children still in foster care but for whom parental rights have been terminated and the termination of such rights is under court appeal?

Answer:

Dispositional hearings would not be required for children for whom termination of parental rights is under court appeal. The outcome of such an appeal would affect whether the child could be placed for adoption, returned home or continued in foster care. Once the appeal is decided, the dispositional hearing should be held as soon as possible unless that decision adjudicates the future status of the child. All subsequent hearings should be held as appropriate until the child is permanently placed.

Periodic reviews to assess the child's case plan are required during the period the appeal is pending.

Question 3:

Must dispositional hearings and periodic reviews be held for children whose 18th birthday or age of emancipation as defined by State law, has been reached prior to the time the hearings or reviews are due?

Answer

Section 427(a)(2)(B) requires that the case review system as defined in section 475(5) be applied to "...each child receiving foster care under the supervision of the State..." Therefore, as long as the child is receiving foster care under the supervision of the State, the dispositional hearing and periodic review requirements must be met. Of course, if a judicial decision has been made that an 18 year old should remain in long term foster care rather than return home or be placed for adoption, further dispositional hearings would not be necessary.

Question 4:

What beginning date should be used for determining the date on which periodic reviews and dispositional hearings are due?

Answer:

Section 427(a)(2)(B) requires a State to have a case review system as defined in section 475(5) for each child "receiving foster care under the supervision of the State." Section 475(5)(B) requires that the "status of each child [b] reviewed periodically but no less frequently than once every six months...in order to determine the continuing necessity for and appropriateness of the placement..." A State may begin counting the six months no later than the date on which it assumes responsibility for the supervision of the child in foster care. The State is also free to choose an earlier date.

For foster children receiving either title IV-E or title IV-A foster care payments, the statute requires that the State agency have responsibility for the child's "placement and care." The State agency need not be given "custody" of the child. Under a similar analysis, that language in section 427(a)(2)(B) that the foster child be "under the supervision of the State" does not necessarily require that the State have "custody" of the child.

The beginning date for counting when the periodic review is due is the date the State assumes responsibility for the child's care. States are free to choose an earlier date but not a later one. Essentially, for most States, this means the date the child is removed from the home will be the starting day for determining when reviews are due.

Since legal custody is not a prerequisite for determining when the case review system applies, voluntary placements are also subject to periodic reviews 6 months after the date the State assumed responsibility for the supervision of the child in foster care.

Dispositional hearings must be held not later than eighteen months after original placement. Thus, States must choose a date no later than the initial date of placement in foster care to begin counting the eighteen months. Again, it must be noted that the State need not necessarily be given custody, only responsibility for the placement and care of the child. In practice there is no difference in the starting date for counting when periodic reviews or dispositional hearings are due.

Question 5:

By what date must periodic reviews and dispositional hearings be completed?

Answer:

States are required to complete periodic reviews and dispositional hearings within the time limits set by the Act. However, during Federal certification reviews, these actions will be considered timely if they are completed on or before the same date in the month following the due date. For example, a review or hearing due June 29 must be held by July 29. This policy applies only to the section 427 compliance review and in no way abrogates the statutory requirements. States

having difficulty completing case reviews and dispositional hearings within the statutory time limits will be expected to take actions to improve their systems.

Questions 6:

How should "interrupted" placements be considered in determining when periodic case reviews and dispositional hearings are due?

Answer:

Interrupted placements may occur when a child is returned home with the intention of remaining home and then return to foster care, when the child is returned home on a trial basis or when the child runs away while in foster care. When a child returned home with the intention of remaining home returns to foster care, it is a new placement and the time for counting dates for periodic reviews and dispositional hearings begins anew. If a child is returned home on a trial basis the placement is considered continuous. A distinction is made between a child's return home with the intent that it be permanent and a child's return home on a trial basis.

If a child runs away while in foster care, unless the responsibility of the State agency is terminated, the placement is still the same. Often, a State's responsibility is terminated and the case closed for runaway children who are not returned within a reasonable time. In these cases, if the child eventually returns and the case is reopened, a new period of foster care is considered to have begun for case reviews and dispositional hearings. If the State retained responsibility for the child during the runaway period, the State should continue periodic reviews and dispositional hearings on the original schedule.

Question 7:

Can cases which are found unacceptable for FY'81 be made acceptable for FY'82?

Answer:

States have a 90 day "grace period" to make cases that are unacceptable in the initial fiscal year under review, acceptable in the following fiscal year. For example, if a case is rejected for FY'81 because it lacks any one of the three major safeguards - case plan, case review, dispositional hearing (if applicable), it may be acceptable for FY'82 if the missing action is completed within the first quarter of the following fiscal year by no later than 12/31/81.

ATTACHMENT E

CASE RECORD SAMPLE SURVEY FOR SEC. 427 of the SOCIAL SECURITY ACT (SSA) ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION

Introduction

The case records are used as the source documents to assess actual service delivery implementation of the Sec. 427 protections for the child and family. The case record may be a single file folder or an aggregate of many case-specific files (child, family, foster parent) that provide the necessary information for assessing the state's eligibility status.

A statistically valid probability sample of case records is assessed using the federal guidance material. There are various alternatives available for the Case Record Sample Survey (CRSS). These relate to the agency which conducts the survey as well as the possible sampling strategies.

Standards for Eligibility

The case record is rated "Acceptable" or "Unacceptable" depending upon the documentation which substantiates implementation of the foster care protections specified in Sec. 427. States which have 80% or more "Acceptable" records will have achieved substantial compliance and will not be subjected to further review for at least two years. States which have 65% or less "Acceptable" records will not be eligible for additional funding as described in Sec. 427.

Provisional eligibility is established when between 66% and 79% of the state's case records are rated "Acceptable" though this will necessitate a federal review in the following fiscal year to determine whether the state has achieved substantial eligibility performance, 80% or greater "Acceptable" case records. States failing to achieve this level of performance will not be considered eligible for additional federal funding in the succeeding fiscal year. Provisional eligibility, between 66% and 79% "Acceptable" case records, is only possible for the initial year in which the state certifies that it is meeting the protections of Sec. 427.

Conduct of the Sample Survey

The state may select one of three approaches to the conduct of the CRSS based on the federal material, The Case Record Survey and Guidelines for Sec. 427 Case Record Survey:

1. The state may assume responsibility for the sample design and conduct of the CRSS. The sample design must receive a prior federal approval. A post survey validation audit of a subsample of the survey sample will be conducted by a federal team.
2. A combined team of state and federal staff under the responsibility of the Regional Program Director will conduct the survey using a sequential sampling plan.
3. The Regional Program Director will conduct the sample survey with a team of federal staff and staff from other states, if available and acceptable to the state being reviewed. The sequential sampling plan will be used in the survey.

Sampling Inspection Design

The statistical problem is that of making a correct inference about a state's entire file of case records from a sample of those records. Whenever a sample is used there is a risk of making one

of two types of errors. Based upon the findings from the sample a state may be considered ineligible when in fact a review of all its case records would indicate that it was eligible. This type of error would have serious consequences for a state as it would deny them additional funds though they were actually providing the protections of Sec. 427. The second type of possible error occurs when a state whose entire case record file was reviewed was considered ineligible but on the basis of a sample review was judged eligible. This is a violation of the legislation and would mean that an opportunity to assist a state in protecting its children in foster care would be lost. There are two approaches:

1. In standard inspection (review) a sample of predetermined size is drawn from the state files in random fashion. Based on a complete review of all case records in this sample the state is considered eligible, provisionally eligible, or ineligible using the standards for eligibility previously discussed.
2. In sequential sampling inspection (review) the size of the sample is left undetermined and the procedure is to review one or several case records at a time with the review continuing until the cumulative evidence is sufficiently strong for the state to be considered eligible, provisionally eligible, or ineligible. To minimize the the probable occurrence of either type of error in states with 1,000 or more children in foster care the risk of occurrence is one error in one thousand. States with less than 1,000 children in foster care will have a higher risk of a wrong decision: one chance in twenty for the first type of error and one chance in one hundred for the second type of error.

A state may use either a standard or sequential sampling inspection design. Sequential sampling will, on the average, require at least 50% fewer case records to be reviewed than standard sampling at the same levels of risk. In addition, sequential sampling has the further merit of being simpler than other methods in that all statistical calculations can be completed in advance so that all that remains is the cumulative counting of the number of "Unacceptable" case records. A Decision Table is computed in advance indicating the number of "Unacceptable" case records necessary to consider the state eligible, provisionally eligible, or ineligible based on the standards and risk factors previously discussed.

In sequential sampling, a review of between 114 to 128 case records on the average will be required for states with 1,000 or more children in foster care to determine whether the state is eligible or ineligible. For states with less than 1,000 children in foster care it will require a review on the average between 48 to 78 case records to make similar decisions. The greatest number of case records will be reviewed to judge a state as provisionally eligible. There is no limit theoretically on the number of reviews necessary to reach a decision. Consequently, it is necessary to limit the number of reviews necessary to reach a decision to 80 for states with less than 1,000 foster care children or 150 for states with 1,000 or more such children. Accordingly, states which have neither been found to be eligible or ineligible by the 80th (less than 1,000 foster care cases) or the 150th (1,000 or more foster care cases) case record review will be considered provisionally eligible.

Size and Selection of the Case Record Sample

Standard Inspection - The size of the sample will be determined by the specific inspection design the state selects using the 95% level of confidence and 5% allowable range from the true percentage. In general, it will require at least 300 case records to be reviewed.

Sequential Inspection - States with 1,000 or more children in foster care will require a maximum review of 150 case records while states with less than 1,000 children in foster care will require a review of a maximum of 80 case records.

Case Record Sampling Criteria - The state's case records are examined for evidence that the state has implemented and is operating a case review system for each child receiving foster care. The case review system includes the following components:

- case plan document,
- periodic review no less frequently than once every six months
- procedural safeguards including dispositional hearing no later than 18 months after the original placement

Most states follow the Federal legislation and conduct the initial periodic case review six months after placement. For the purposes of the case record review it is necessary to obtain a random sample of children who have been in placement six or more months as of September 30, 1981, the close of FY 1981. Children entering placement April 1, 1981 or later should be excluded.

States with legislation or written policy guidelines or regulations which initiates periodic case reviews prior to six months after placement may include such cases in the case record sample. Thus, all children who have been in foster care for a least one periodic case review by September 30, 1981 may be included in the universe of case records to be sampled, i.e., a state which begins the periodic review at 45 days after placement may include children who entered placement by August 15, 1981 or earlier.

As a very small sample of case records is inspected it is necessary to use a stratified random sample to provide evidence that the case plan, the periodic case review, and the procedural safeguards including the dispositional hearing have been implemented and are operating in accordance with the legislation.

The case records for children in foster care which are to be sampled are divided into two groups:

- I. Case records for children whose original placement occurred prior to April 1, 1980. This group of children would have been in placement 18 months or longer by the close of FY 1981, September 30, 1981. A total of 90 such case records should be randomly selected. An additional six records should be selected for sample attrition.
- II. Case records for children who have been in placement for less than 18 months but long enough for at least one periodic case review due by September 30, 1981. For example, a state which begins its review 45 days after placement would include all case records of children entering placement from April 1, 1980 through August 15, 1981. A total of 60

such case records should be randomly selected. An additional four records should be selected for sample attrition.

The two sub-samples (I and II) are combined into a single sample with a random assignment of reading sequence using the table of random numbers.

Random Selection - The selection of the random sample is facilitated by making available a listing by case number of all the children in foster care who meet the above selection parameters.

The listing should be submitted to the Regional Office where the following random selection will be made:

- 160 children will be selected for state with 1,000 or more children in foster care, or
- 85 children will be selected for states with less than 1,000 children in foster care.

There is an oversampling of 10 and five children respectively to allow for sampling attrition due to unforeseen circumstances. Some states have computerized systems which will automatically select a random sample. Any procedure is acceptable that produces a valid random sample based on the above discussed parameters.

Review Sites

The least burdensome and most efficient review procedure is achieved through the assembly of the entire random sample of case records at a single site. This may not be possible in some states and it will be necessary to use two or three sites. This affects the deployment of reviewers and no less than two reviewers should be assigned to one site. This is necessary to minimize idiosyncratic reviewer bias.

States which will conduct their own assessment may use as many sites as they deem necessary. However, for the post validation review it will be necessary to assemble the subsample records at one to three sites.

Post Survey validation Audit

States electing to conduct their own Case Record Survey will receive a post survey validation audit of at least 50% or 40 of the same case records reviewed by the state, whichever is higher. To reduce the burden for the state, the validation audit will be scheduled for the day following the completion of the state review so that a sub-sample of the records reviewed by the state can readily be selected at the review sites. This will minimize the time that the records are kept at the selected sites as those records not included in the subsample may be returned immediately to agency files.

The selection of the subsample of reviewed case records is based on a stratified random sample procedures:

1. Select the first 15 cases reviewed.
2. Select the final 10 cases reviewed.
3. Select randomly the number of cases from the balance of the reviewed case records to complete the sample size of 40 case records or 50% of the total case records reviewed, whichever is higher, e.g. for a subsample of 40 case records select the first 15 records and last 10 records reviewed. Add an additional 15 records randomly selected from the balance of the reviewed records. For a possible subsample of 125 case records select the first 15 records and the final 10 records and 100 additional records randomly selected from the balance.

At the completion of the federal review the state will be notified of all disagreements, if any, and an opportunity provided to resolve all differences. The results from the State Survey and the Validation Audit will be forwarded to the Regional Program Director who will determine the state's eligibility status using the standards previously discussed. This recommendation will be forwarded to the central office.

Decision Tables

There are two Decision Tables for sequential sampling: Decision Table I is to be used with states with 1,000 or more children in foster care; and Decision Table II is to be used with states with less than 1,000 children in foster care as of the end of the fiscal year for which additional funds are claimed. The two tables are used in the same manner, the only difference is the number of case records to be reviewed. The instructions for using Decision Table I should be used for Decision Table II as well. All that changes is the cut-off in the reading of case records--150 case records for Table I and 80 records for Table II.

Decision Tables I and II contain seven columns:

- Col. 1. Case Record I.D. - The review supervisor enters the case record I.D. of every case that is reviewed in the sequence in which the review is completed, case by case. This should follow the random selection sequence allowing for deletion of case records that do not meet selection criteria.
2. Number of Records Reviewed - This is a sequential listing of the cumulative number of records reviewed beginning with 1 and ending with 150 (or 80 for Decision Table II) for the last record that may be reviewed, e.g. the number 54 would indicate that a total of 54 records have been reviewed.
3. Acceptance Number - This column represents the maximum number of "Unacceptable" case records that are necessary to make the decision that the State is eligible. No decision to accept a State can be made before at least 34 (or 22 for Decision Table II) case records have been reviewed. At that point in the review, there cannot be any "Unacceptable" case records. The total number of "Unacceptable" case records cannot exceed 31 (or 15 for Decision Table II) for the State to be eligible
4. Unacceptable: Actual/Cumulative - This represents the actual and the cumulative total of

"Unacceptable" case records. The review supervisor enters the actual and cumulative total number of "Unacceptable" case records in this column as each record review is completed and the results from the Reviewer's Tally Sheet are transferred to the Decision Table. Enter "O" for an "Acceptable" case record and "1" for an "Unacceptable" case record. This cumulative total of "Unacceptable" case records is compared, line by line, with the corresponding figures in columns 3 and 5. Whenever the number in this column equals the number of either column 3 or 5 the review process stops and a decision is made. If the cumulative number in column 4 equals the number in column 3 the decision is made to consider the state eligible. If the cumulative number in column 4 is between the numbers in columns 3 and 5 the review process continues until the 150th case record is reviewed. If, at that point, the number of rejected case records is more than 31 (or 15 for Decision Table II) but less than 50 (or 26 for Decision Table II) the review process is terminated and a decision of provisional eligibility is made. If the cumulative number in column 4 equals the number in column 5 the decision is made that the state is ineligible.

5. Rejection Number - This column represents the minimum number of "Unacceptable" case records that are necessary to make the decision that the state is ineligible.
6. Reviewer's Initial - The reviewer initials the entry made by the supervisor for each completed case record review.
7. Supervisor's Initials - The review supervisor initials the entry made for each completed case record review.

Procedures

The procedures for conducting the review of the case records for sequential sampling are essentially similar for all states and other political jurisdictions.

Respectively, the procedure is as follows:

1. The state is asked to submit a listing of all children who have been in foster care by September 30th of the fiscal year in which additional monies were claimed. At the time of selection of the random sample the child's case may still be active or may have been closed subsequent to September 30th. One of the following two restrictions on the state's listing of children in foster care should also be observed:
 - States which have legislation or written policy guidelines or regulations to initiate periodic reviews before six months, e.g., 45 days, should include in the listing all children who have been in foster care for at least 45 days or any other earlier period by the close of the fiscal year.
 - States which initiate the periodic review at six months should include in the listing all children who have been in foster care for at least six months by the close of the fiscal year.

2. The Children's Bureau will select a random sample of 160 or 85 case numbers using a Table of Random Digits (See Appendix A). There is an over-sampling of 10 and 5 cases respectively to substitute for any case record that is inappropriately included. A stratified random sample will be selected as described on p.4.
3. The listing of 160 or 85 case numbers will be sent to the state in advance of the review for the state to assemble the 160 or 85 case records at a designated site(s) for review.
4. The Regional Office Eligibility Determination Reviewers will each begin reviewing the case records using the instruction manual and criteria. The reviewer(s) will lead the records in the sequence of case numbers indicated on the Reviewer's Tally Sheet supplied by the Children's Bureau. After each record is reviewed the reviewer indicates the review outcome (Acceptable = 0 or Unacceptable =1) and initials the line.
5. The Reviewer's Tally Sheet is brought to the Review Supervisor who enters the data in the Decision Table and then initials the Reviewer's Tally Sheet on the same line. The reviewer initials the Decision Table.
6. The reviewer continues to read records until the Review Supervisor terminates further review or until the 150th or 80th case record is reviewed.

When the case record review is completed the Decision Table and the review's Tally Sheets are assembled with all the other documentation the Eligibility Determination Study.

Confidentiality

Reviewers reading case records are prohibited from discussing any of the material with anyone other than the review supervisor. No effort should be made for clarification from the caseworker or line supervisor. Questions of documentation may be discussed with the State's Resource Advisor as designated. Nothing should be entered in the case records nor should any of the review material be left in the office after the review is completed.

Technical Note: Statistical Computation

The sequential probability ratio test* was used for the binomial distribution when the result of a single case record review is a classification of accept or reject and when the result of the test for the state is acceptable certification for meeting the eligibility criteria or a finding of unacceptable certification when the performance indicated the criteria have not been met. The four quantities that completely determine the sequential inspection plan for states with 1,000 or more children in foster care are:

(a) $P1 = .20$ the "acceptable" quality limit for the state, expressed as a fraction of unacceptable case records,

(b) $P2 = .35$ the "unacceptable" quality limit for the state expressed as a fraction of unacceptable records,

(c) $\alpha = .001$ the maximum risk of rejecting certification of states of quality P1 or better, expressed as a decimal fraction, and

(d) $\beta = .001$ the maximum risk of accepting certification of states of quality P2 or worse, expressed as a decimal fraction.

Using these four quantities the formulas for the Acceptance Numbers (Column 3) and Rejection Numbers (Column 5) of Decision Table I are:

$$\text{Acceptance Number} = -9.0018 + .2706 \times \text{number of records reviewed}$$

$$\text{Rejection Number} = 9.0018 + .2706 \times \text{number of records reviewed}$$

* Statistical Research Group, Columbia University, Sequential Analysis of Statistical Data: Applications, Columbia University Press, New York, 1945.

Similarly, the four quantities that completely determine the sequential sampling plan for states with less than 1,000 foster care cases are:

(a) $P1 = .20$

(b) $P2 = .35$

(c) $\alpha = .05$

(d) $\beta = .01$

The formulas for the Acceptance Numbers (Column 3) and Rejection Numbers (Column 5) of Decision Table II are:

$$\text{Acceptance Number} = -5.9352 + .2706 \times \text{number of records reviewed}$$

$$\text{Rejection Number} = 3.8913 + .2706 \times \text{number of records reviewed}$$

State/Federal Reliability Check

Whenever the state selects the option of having a joint team of state and federal staff review the case records there is a simple procedure to check the reliability of the results.

The following assumptions are made:

- The state personnel read approximately as many records as federal personnel, in toto.
- Records for review are assigned randomly to state and federal staff.
- The review process is reliable when reviewers have been trained.

Under these assumptions the numbers of "Unacceptable" records noted by both groups respectively should be similar except for sampling error. E.g., if each group read 75 records (a total of 150) and the state people found 14 Unacceptable and the federal staff found 19 Unacceptable the difference is probably due to fluctuations in sampling and a valid conclusion can be made that both samples come from the same universe of state case records.

When the difference is much greater there is cause for concern. The size of a significant difference varies with the number of records that the state staff and federal staff have read respectively. The following table indicates the minimum difference that cannot be accounted for through sampling error:

No. of Case Records Read by Each Team	Minimum Difference in Number of Unacceptable Records Which Indicates Possible Unreliability
30 records	
40 "	
50 "	
60 "	6 records
75 "	8 "
	9 "
	9 "
	10 "

A review in which the state staff found 8 Unacceptable records after reading 40 and the federal staff found 17 Unacceptable records, a difference of 9 records, would be questionable. The federal team would have to review at least 50% of the records reviewed by the state staff to validate the review process.

DECISION TABLE I

View Supervisor Telephone Number	State Dates					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Base Record I.D.	Number Records Reviewed	Acceptance Number	Unacceptable* Actual Cumulative	Rejection Number	Reviewer's Initial	Supervisor Initial
	1	-		-		
	2	-		-		
	3	-		-		
	4	-		-		
	5	-		-		
	6	-		-		

7	-	-
8	-	-
9	-	-
10	-	-
11	-	-
12	-	-
13	-	13
14	-	13
15	-	14
16	-	14
17	-	14
18	-	14
19	-	15
20	-	15
21	-	15
22	-	15
23	-	16
24	-	16
25	-	16
26	-	17
27	-	17
28	-	17
29	-	17
30	-	18
31	-	18
32	-	18
33	-	18
34	0	19
35	0	19
36	0	19
37	1	20

38	1	20
39	1	20
40	1	20
41	2	21
42	2	21
43	2	21
44	2	21
45	3	22
46	3	22
47	3	22
48	3	22
49	4	23
50	4	23
51	4	23
52	5	24
53	5	24
54	5	24
55	5	24
56	6	25
57	6	25
58	6	25
59	6	25
60	7	26
61	7	26
62	7	26
63	8	27
64	8	27
65	8	27
66	8	27
67	9	28
68	9	28

69	9	28
70	9	28
71	10	29
72	10	29
73	10	29
74	11	30
75	11	30
76	11	30
76	11	30
77	11	30
78	12	31
79	12	31
80	12	31
81	12	31
82	13	32
83	13	32
84	13	32
85	14	33
86	14	33
87	14	33
88	14	33
89	15	34
90	15	34
91	15	34
92	15	34
93	16	35
94	16	35
95	16	35
96	16	35
97	17	36
98	17	36

99	17	36
100	18	37
101	18	37
102	18	37
103	18	37
104	19	38
105	19	38
106	19	38
107	19	38
108	20	39
109	20	39
110	20	39
111	21	40
112	21	40
113	21	40
114	21	40
115	22	41
116	22	41
117	22	41
118	22	41
119	23	42
120	23	42
121	23	42
122	24	43
123	24	43
124	24	43
125	24	43
126	25	44
127	25	44
128	25	44
129	25	44

130	26	45
131	26	45
132	26	45
133	26	45
134	27	46
135	27	46
136	27	46
137	28	47
138	28	47
139	28	47
140	28	47
141	29	48
142	29	48
143	29	48
144	29	48
145	30	49
146	30	49
147	30	49
148	31	50
149	31	50
150	31	50

Date

Review

Supervisor (Signature)

* Accept - 0

Reject - 1

DECISION TABLE II
(Less than 1,000 Foster care Cases)

View Supervisor

State

Telephone Number

Dates

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Base Record I.D.	Number Records Reviewed	Acceptance Number	Unacceptable* Actual Cumulative	Rejection Number	Reviewer's Initial	Supervisor Initial
	1	-		-		
	2	-		-		
	3	-		-		
	4	-		-		
	5	-		-		
	6	-		6		
	7	-		6		
	8	-		7		
	9	-		7		
	10	-		7		
	11	-		7		
	12	-		8		
	13	-		8		
	14	-		8		
	15	-		8		
	16	-		9		
	17	-		9		
	18	-		9		
	19	-		10		
	20	-		10		
	21	-		10		
	22	0		10		
	23	0		11		
	24	0		11		
	25	0		11		
	26	1		11		
	27	1		12		

28	1	12
29	1	12
30	2	13
31	2	13
32	2	13
33	2	13
34	3	14
35	3	14
36	3	14
37	4	14
38	4	15
39	4	15
40	4	15
41	5	15
42	5	16
43	5	16
44	5	16
45	6	17
46	6	17
47	6	17
48	7	17
49	7	18
50	7	18
51	7	18
52	8	18
53	8	19
54	8	19
54	8	19
55	8	19
56	9	20
57	9	20

58	9	20
59	10	20
60	10	21
61	10	21
62	10	21
63	11	21
64	11	22
65	11	22
66	11	22
67	12	23
68	12	23
69	12	23
70	13	23
71	13	24
72	13	24
73	13	24
74	14	24
75	14	25
76	14	25
77	14	25
78	15	25
79	15	26
80	15	26

* Accept - 0

Reject - 1

REVIEWER'S TALLY SHEET

Reviewer	State	
Office Telephone Number	Telephone Number	
Case Number or I.D.	Review Outcome Accept = 0 Reject = 1	Initial Reviewer Supervisor

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- 14.
- 15.

Reviewer's Signature

Date

ANNUAL BUDGET REQUEST FOR TITLE IV-B FUNDS

Fiscal Year 19

State of Utah October 1, 1983 through September 30, 1984

Revision #

I. COMPUTATION OF FEDERAL GRANT AWARD

A) Total Estimated title IV-B expenditures	2,624,612
B) Enter Federal Share (75% of A up to maximum listed in Action Transmittal):	1,555,855

II. REQUEST FOR GRANT AWARD

Indicate the total request for the year and the request for each of the four quarters. (Fund totaling more than the state's share of the \$141 million allotment will not be released to the State until there has been verification that the State meets the conditions of P.L. 96-272 for those funds.)

Total (from line I.B)	1st Q (Oct.-Dec.)	2nd Q (Jan.-Mar.)	3rd Q (Apr.-Jun.)	4th Q (Jul.-Sept.)
1,555,855	389,155	388,900	388,900	388,900

III. CERTIFICATION BY STATE AGENCY

The State Agency submits the above estimate and request of grant award under title IV-B of the Social Security Act, as amended, and agrees that the estimated expenditures will be made in accordance with the Child Welfare Services Plan, agreed to by the Agency and the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, for the fiscal year ending , 19 .

(Signature) Administrator, Social Services Agency

Director, Division of Family Services
(Title-please type)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS
5-23-83
Date Regional Office Appr

(Signature) Director, Single Organization Unit

Exec. Director, Dept. of Social Services
(Title-Please type)

5-23-83 Regional Program
Date Director

Other State Official (OPTIONAL)

Date 09-30-83
Date

Signature Title